Tetrahedron Letters No. 39, pp 3413 - 3416, 1977. Pergamon Press. Printed in Great Britain.

## SYNTHESIS OF THIOPHENES FROM ACETYLENES AND <u>BIS</u>-AMINE DISULFIDES Francisco M. Benitez and John R. Grunwell\* Department of Chemistry, Miami University Oxford, Ohio 45056

(Received in USA 13 June 1977; received in UK for publication 9 August 1977)

The reversible formation of thionitroxyl radicals  $\underline{1}$  from the thermolysis of <u>bis</u>-amine disulfides  $\underline{2}$  has been observed by esr spectroscopy<sup>1</sup>,<sup>2</sup>. These radicals are reputed to be relatively unreactive. We now report that <u>bis</u>-amine disulfides react regiospecifically with unsymmetrical acetylenes  $\underline{4}$  to produce thiophenes, a reaction, which we propose is initiated by the addition of  $\underline{1}$  to  $\underline{4}$  to form a radical 3 as shown in Scheme I.

The predominant thiophene isomer depends on the R substituent in <u>4</u>. Phenylacetylene (R=Ph) and morpholinodisulfide <u>5</u> gave 2,4-diphenylthiophene and 2,5diphenylthiophene in a 3:1 ratio, while methyl propiolate (R=CO<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>3</sub>) and <u>5</u> formed dimethyl 2,5-thiophenedicarboxylate. (Table I). The reaction with ethyl phenylpropiolate and <u>5</u> was studied to determine which substituent, phenyl or  $CO_2R$ , controls the regiospecificity. The exclusive formation of diethyl 3, 4-diphenyl-2, 5-thiophenedicarboxylate demonstrates the dominance of the  $CO_2R$  group. These last two reactions represent improved, convenient one step syntheses of compounds which were prepared by multi-step lower yield routes<sup>3,4</sup>.

In order to explain the reversal in regiospecificity of thiophene formation, we propose a mechanism which involves the collapse of the radical 3 to a thiirene<sup>5-7</sup>6. The fate of the nitrogen fragment is not clear as we have been unable to isolate non-polymeric nitrogen containing material.

The direction in which  $\underline{6}$  opens to form the 1,3-dipoles  $\underline{7}$  and  $\underline{8}$  depends on R. When R is  $CO_2R$ ,  $\underline{6}$  will open to give  $\underline{8}$ . In this way the  $CO_2R$  group is not substituted on a carbon which is electron deficient. However, when R is a phenylgroup, which will delocalize the positive charge in  $\underline{7}$ ,  $\underline{6}$  will open to produce  $\underline{7}$ instead of  $\underline{8}$ . The dipoles  $\underline{7}$  and  $\underline{8}$  will react with more acetylene to generate the thiophenes  $\underline{9}$  and  $\underline{10}$ , respectively<sup>8</sup>.

## SCHEME I



<u>4</u>		2	CS <sub>2</sub>	<u>9</u> b	<u>10</u> <sup>b</sup>	<u>12</u> <sup>c</sup>	% Yield <sup>d</sup>
R=Ph	R´=H	13	no	85	15		82
R=Ph	R´=H	13	yes	74	26	45	25
R=Ph	R′=H	5	no	74	26		52
R=CO <sub>2</sub> CH <sub>3</sub>	R≤=H	5	no	0	100		48
R=CO <sub>2</sub> Et	R⁻=Ph	5	no	0	100		67
R=CO <sub>2</sub> Et	R'=Ph	5	yes			99	

Table I. Summary Of Products And Yields<sup>a</sup>

a) experiments were conducted at 140° for 3 hours without  $CS_2$  and 24 hours in a Parr bomb reactor with  $CS_2$  at 140°, all compounds were identified by ms, nmr, ir, and comparison with known compounds where appropriate.

b) relative yields of thiophene isomers were determined by glpc.

c) isolated yield of <u>12</u> based on one atom of sulfur transfered from the disulfide. d) isolated yield of <u>9</u> + <u>10</u> based on one atom of sulfur transfered from the disulfide.

In principle the dipole <u>8</u> can react with <u>4</u> to give <u>9</u> as well as <u>10</u> depending on which way the unsymmetrical acetylene orients with respect to <u>8</u>. The formation of <u>10</u> to the exclusion of <u>9</u> can be understood in terms of frontier molecular orbital theory<sup>9</sup>. The dipole <u>8</u> may be viewed as having an empty 2p orbital which is located on the postively charged carbon and is perpendicular to the  $\pi$ -orbitals of the thioenolate. We propose that the reaction between <u>4</u> and <u>8</u> is initiated by the interaction of the empty 2p orbital of <u>8</u> with the  $\pi$ -HOMO of <u>4</u>. The R<sup>\*</sup> carbon of <u>8</u> will become bonded to the R<sup>\*</sup> carbon of <u>4</u>, giving rise to <u>10</u> rather than <u>9</u>, because the coefficient for the atomic 2p $\pi$  orbital located on the R<sup>\*</sup> carbon is larger than that for the R carbon in the HOMO of <u>4</u>. The same argument holds for the reaction  $\underline{7} + \underline{4} + \underline{9}$ .

Dipoles  $\underline{7}$  and  $\underline{8}$  are known<sup>10,11</sup> to react with carbon disulfide <u>11</u> to give trithiocarbonates <u>12</u>. When the reactions between <u>5</u> and ethyl phenylpropiolate, and between 2,2,6,6-tetramethylpiperidino-disulfide <u>13</u> and phenylacetylene were

conducted with <u>11</u> present substantial amounts of <u>12</u> were produced as shown in Table I. The reaction represents a useful one step synthesis of trithiocarbonates which are intermediates in the preparation of tetrathiafulvalenes<sup>12</sup>.

Two mechansims are ruled out by the formation of <u>10</u> from methyl propiolate and ethyl phenylpropiolate. First, the dimerization of <u>7</u> or <u>8</u> to form a 1,4dithiin followed by elimination of sulfur will lead to exclusive production of <u>9</u>. The addition of the radical <u>3</u> to <u>4</u> in the same direction as the addition of <u>1</u> to <u>4</u> will give a radical which will collapse to 9 only.

In summary, we have found a useful one step synthesis for thiophenes and trithiocarbonates. We propose that the regiospecificity in thiophene formation is due to the interaction between substituent R and the electron deficient carbon atom in the dipoles <u>7</u> and <u>8</u>. Further experiments concerning the scope and limitations of the reactions will be presented later.

## References

- 1. W. C. Danen and D. D. Newkirk, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 98, 516 (1976).
- 2. B. Maillard and K. U. Ingold, ibid, 98, 520 (1976).
- 3. S. Oae, N. Furukawa, T. Watanabe, Y. Otsuji, and M. Hamata, <u>Bull. Chem. Soc.</u> Japan, 38, 1247 (1965).
- 4. H. J. Backer and W. Stevens, Rec. Trav. Chim., 59, 423 (1940).
- 5. O. P. Strausz, J. Font, E. L. Dedio, P. Kebarle, and H. E. Gunning, <u>J. Am.</u> Chem. Soc., 89, 4805 (1967).
- 6. M. J. S. Dewar and C. A. Ramsden, J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Comm., 688 (1973).
- 7. K. P. Zeller, H. Meier, and E. Müller, Tet. Let., 537 (1971).
- 8. L. Benati, P. C. Montevecchi, and G. Zanardi, J. Org. Chem., 43, 575 (1977).
- 9. K. N. Houk, Acc. Chem. Res., 8, 361 (1975).
- 10. R. Huisgen and V. Weberndorfer, Experientia, 17, 566 (1961).
- 11. S. Hunig and E. Fleckenstein, Ann, 138, 192 (1970).
- 12. H. D. Hartzler, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 92, 1412 (1970).